

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

12 WILLIAM O. ROBINSON,
13 Plaintiff,
14
15 vs.
16 DIETER ECKERT, et al.,
Defendants.

CIV F 05 0448 REC LJO P

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE

18 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42
19 U.S.C. § 1983, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
20 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity
21 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants
22 reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions
23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action
24 is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in
25 which the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b).

26 In this case, none of the defendants reside in this district. The claim arose in San Luis
27 Obispo County, which is in the Central District of California. Therefore, plaintiff's claim should
28 have been filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. In the

1 interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct
2 district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States
4 District Court for the Central District of California.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated:** April 20, 2005 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
8 i0d3h8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28